DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 230 215 JC 830 191

TITLE	Principles and Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation at South Oklahoma City Junior College. Revised FY 1982-83.
INSTITUTION	South Oklahoma City Junior Coll., Okla.
PUB DATE	83
NOTE	31p.
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Principles; *College Faculty; Community Colleges; *Evaluation Criteria; *Self Evaluation (Individuals); Standards; *Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Evaluation; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

Materials used in South Oklahoma City Junior College's faculty evaluation process are presented in these three booklets. First, the principles and guidelines applying to all areas of the faculty evaluation process are presented, including: (1) evaluation is dependent upon shared responsibility and rigorous professional judgments; (2) only agreed upon items are evaluated; (3) information upon which the evaluation is based should be known to both the faculty member and manager prior to the performance conference; (4) evaluation deals with quality rather than quantity and includes subjective and objective judgments; (5) evaluation is based on a non-exclusive set of standard indicators, and in any given area more than one indicator may be needed to derive a rating; and (6) special objectives (e.g., retention, recruitment, or staff development) are evaluated under the area of the evaluation form to which they apply. Next, principles and guidelines for specific areas to be evaluated are presented. The next two booklets contain the faculty self-evaluation form and the manager evaluation of faculty performance form, which provide criteria for judging faculty effectiveness with students, course learning materials, instructional programs, administrative functions, and college and community activities. These two forms present indicators of standard, below standard, and above standard performance and explain the weights to be assigned to each of the five evaluation categories. (HB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED230215

PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION AT SOUTH OKLAHOMA CITY JUNIOR COLLEGE

Revised FY 1982-83

JC 830 191

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Annmarie Shirazi

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES
FOR
FACULTY EVALUATION FORM

Certain principles or guidelines should apply in all areas covered in the faculty evaluation process. Some of these are as follows:

A. EVALUATION IS DEPENDENT UPON SHARED RESPONSIBILITY AND RIGOROUS PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENTS.

Fundamental to successful evaluation is the recognition and acceptance of shared responsibility. At South Oklahoma City Junior College prior to the formal evaluation conference, the faculty person completes a self-evaluation and the manager completes an evaluation of the faculty person, each using a common instrument. At the conference, full consideration is given by each party to both evaluations. At the conclusion of the conference, the manager draws conclusions and renders a summative statement and rating of the faculty person's performance for that period.

The faculty person and the manager must undertake evaluation with candor, honesty, and care, exercising their best professional judgments in each stage of the process.

B. ONLY AGREED TO ITEMS ARE EVALUATED.

Inherent within the evaluation philosophy of the college is that a faculty person is evaluated upon what he/she has agreed. These agreements are made in several ways.

1. When a faculty person accepts employment with the college, he or she agrees to
   a. Support and promote the functions, philosophy and goals of the college as outlined in the college master plan and bulletin.
   b. Abide by the procedures as outlined in the *Board of Regents Policy Manual* and *Employee Handbook*.
   c. Fulfill the role and duties outlined in the job description for a faculty person.
2. At the beginning of each year, a contract is signed which includes the projected teaching load and any general or special objectives.
3. During the course of a year the faculty person and manager may reach other specific agreements, the content of which may be properly included in the evaluation.

C. INFORMATION USED IN THE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SHOULD BE KNOWN TO BOTH PARTIES PRIOR TO THE PERFORMANCE CONFERENCE.

An ideal, toward which we strive, is that both the manager and the faculty person draw from the same set of materials for the evaluation. Both will use information drawn from students, peers, and from their own observations. Both have considerable responsibility to communicate to each other the information being used, particularly information that only one of the two might possess.

Much of the data is communicated to both through ongoing institutional processes. Both receive or possess data on student progress, completion and perceptions. Materials developed by the faculty person; such as learning materials, program evaluation or development materials, schedule and budget information, etc., which are processed through the manager are obviously known to both and the manager will have formally or informally discussed their quality with the faculty person.

Other information, however, may not always be known to both. If students or peers have made positive or negative comments to the faculty person and manager, it is known to both. If the comments are made to only one, and the information is to be used, then the one has the responsibility to communicate that information to the other. Similarly, a faculty person may have been productively involved in a college or community activity without the knowledge of the manager. Such information should be communicated to the manager if it is to be used in the self evaluation.

The principle that applies is that each person is responsible for knowing that information is possessed by both parties and for communicating either formally or informally that information which may be known to only one party. The extent to which this shared responsibility is carried out influences the extent to which the manager's evaluation and self evaluation will match.

D. EVALUATION DEALS WITH QUALITY RATHER THAN QUANTITY.

The evaluation process deals primarily with the quality of a person's performance. The workload process deals primarily with the quantity. Quantity enters the evaluation process only in regards to the amount produced as compared with the amount one agreed to produce. For example, if a faculty person has agreed to and has developed three learning packets, he or she will be compensated for them through the workload formula. The number of packets is pertinent in the evaluation only to the extent that they were developed or not developed according to the agreement. If they were developed, it is their quality that is pertinent to the evaluation.

E. OBJECTIVE & SUBJECTIVE JUDGMENTS OCCUR IN EVALUATION.

Much of the information used in the evaluation is objective in nature. However, the data is processed by humans and is used to consider perceived human performance. In the final analysis, the summation of the self evaluation must be a result of the reasoned professional judgment of the faculty person, and the summation of the faculty person's performance must be a result of the reasoned professional judgment of the manager.

F. BELOW STANDARD INDICATORS: WHEN QUESTIONS APPEAR TO EXIST WITH THESE INDICATORS, THEY MUST BE RESOLVED BEFORE CONSIDERING THE STANDARD INDICATORS.

Each area includes indicators of below standard performance. These indicators were derived in an effort to establish certain minimum conditions that must exist before a standard or above standard rating may be considered. It there appear to be questions in these fundamental areas, the questions must first be resolved. The presence of the question need not result in a below standard rating; rather the presence of the question requires resolution before standard or higher ratings are considered. The resolution process will usually be a simple one. More often than not a conversation between the manager and faculty person reveals that extenuating circumstances or conditions beyond the control of the faculty person explain the presence of the question. At other times an agreement reached between the faculty person and manager will satisfactorily resolve the question. Occasionally, more complex processes might be required. Ordinarily, the faculty person and manager will have discussed and, ideally, will have resolved the question prior to the performance conference.

For example, a class has operated for a major portion of a term without a learning packet. The question of "materials not in the hand of students when needed" is raised. If the packet was contracted to be completed prior to the entry point, was not available when needed, and extenuating circumstances are not present, then the performance in Area II, Instructor Effectiveness with Course Learning Materials, could be judged substandard regardless of the quality of the learning materials within the learning packet.

Another example should suffice. A manager may have received enough comments from students about an instructor's "fairness" to conclude that the question of "fairness" has been raised. If inquiry results in defensible data that the faculty person is arbitrary and capricious, then the question is resolved and a substandard rating is given. What is more likely, however, is that inquiry will reveal that the faculty person is indeed fair with students, but that certain ones of them may have developed perceptions of unfairness. At this point the question of "fairness" has been resolved and the indicators of standard performance may now be considered.

G. LISTS OF PERFORMANCE INDICATORS ARE NOT INTENDED TO BE EXCLUSIVE.

Although each area includes lists of standard, above standard, and below standard indicators, these lists are not intended to exclude other possibilities. There may be other indicators of standard and above standard performance that are particular to a given faculty person's role as a teaching professional but are too specific to be included in a list that pertains to most faculty persons.

The below standard indicators state the more negative factors within each area as they apply to most faculty persons. However, no attempt was made to define what should be certain, self-evident aspects of sub-standard performance. For example, it is unnecessary to specify such indicators as "Faculty person claimed authorship of certain learning material which was in fact written by another."

Nonetheless, any non-listed indicator which is used to assign either above or below standard must be one which is pertinent to the performance area as it is defined.

H. IN DERIVING A RATING WITHIN AN AREA, ONE OR MORE THAN ONE OF THE INDICATORS MAY NEED TO BE USED.

In using the performance indicators the principle of "one or more" must apply. With the exception of Area I, Instructor Effectiveness with Students, it is deliberate and desirable that no minimum or maximum number is specified as to the number of indicators that must be present for a given rating. This flexibility is distinctly within the best interests of the individual faculty person as well as for the college.

For example, if a faculty person is developing or revising a learning packet, all the standard performance indicators for a learning packet (II.A.1.) may need to be considered whereas only one of the related items under "above standard" might need to be considered. On the other hand, a faculty person may be into a considerable project of revising tests for a course or courses, in which case perhaps only the item concerning multiple testing (II.A.3) might need to be considered for standard performance and only the item concerning test item analysis (II.C.5.) might need be considered for above standard performance.

I. SPECIAL OBJECTIVES ARE EVALUATED UNDER THE AREA TO WHICH THEY PERTAIN.

When special objectives, e.g., retention, recruitment, or staff development, have been agreed to in a contract, the evaluation of them should be considered under the area within the evaluation form to which the objective applies. For example, some retention objectives may pertain to operating upon chances for student success within a particular course. If the objective deals with faculty interaction with students, it is best evaluated under Area I, Instructor Effectiveness with Students. If the objective deals with alteration of learning materials or evaluation processes, it is best evaluated under Area II, Instructor Effectiveness with Course Learning Materials. Further, retention objectives which deal with tracking majors would be evaluated under Area III, Instructor Effectiveness with Instructional Programs, etc.

PRINCIPLES & GUIDELINES
(SPECIFIC TO SINGLE AREAS)

AREA I, INSTRUCTOR EFFECTIVENESS WITH STUDENTS

1. The indicators of instructor effectiveness with students, 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 13, 16, 18, were ranked in order of importance by the faculty and by the Instructional Affairs Staff and a composite result used to identify items 1, 2, 8, 12, 13, as special indicators.

2. Since the data collected from the SIR's is a summation of student perceptions, special attention should be given to the size of the sample. A workable rule-of-thumb is to view with caution any data which is based upon fewer than twenty responses.

3. Although this area gives considerable attention to data collected using the Student Instructional Report, both manager and faculty person should keep in mind that other data as well as other items from the SIR may be introduced into consideration. For that reason the "qualifying indicators" in I.C.4. are of considerable importance. These indicators are presented as ones which exist upon a continuum which may range from the negative to the positive. However, certain factors come into play when considering each of the indicators.

    a. Negative changes in SIR data are already reflected in the initial rating.

    b. Changes in percent of student success *per se* may or may not be an indicator of instructor performance. When this indicator is to be used, additional information should exist which suggests the change is related to instructor performance.

    c. Formal or informal comments from students should be used when they are sufficient in quality or quantity to be pertinent. Any time they are to be used negatively, the manager should have made special efforts to verify their validity.

    d. The principle stated in c. above applies also to observations made by the manager.

    e. The qualifying indicator concerning SIR items is included to allow the faculty person and manager the flexibility to include SIR items not ordinarily used for Area I. The principle of prior agreement is very important here.

    f. A faculty person's accessibility to students is useful as a qualifier to the degree that accessibility, or lack of it, influences students chances for success.

PRINCIPLES & GUIDELINES
(SPECIFIC TO SINGLE AREAS)

AREA II, INSTRUCTOR EFFECTIVENESS WITH COURSE LEARNING MATERIALS

1. Learning materials which may be considered in this area are those which have been developed and formally evaluated during the course of the contract year.
2. Prior to the deadline for submitting learning materials, the faculty person has the option of working developmentally with the manager to produce quality learning materials.

PRINCIPLES & GUIDELINES
(SPECIFIC TO SINGLE AREAS)

AREA V, INSTRUCTOR EFFECTIVENESS WITH COLLEGE AND COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

1. Activities to be considered in this area are those which are clearly related to the mission and goals of the college and in which the faculty person is representing the college. Being active in a church or civic club in the community is usually related to one's private life as a citizen. Working with the faculty association is usually promoting the important, but special interests, of the faculty. On the other hand, if a faculty person, as a college representative, is working with a church, civic club, or association in a community or institutional development project, then the activity is pertinent.

2. Historically, higher education faculties have been considered to have three major functions: instruction, research, and extension and public service. The faculties of comprehensive universities traditionally participate in all three. The faculties of the community college traditionally participate in two: instruction and extension and public service.

   The intent of Area V is to recognize and evaluate the ways in which the college faculty extend themselves beyond the classroom to serve other needs of the internal and external college community. For the community colleges in general, and this college in particular, these activities usually fall into three categories:

   a. participation in and contribution to college committees and organizations;

   b. participation in and contribution to extracurricular activities generated by the college;

   c. participation in and contribution to community activities and events.

3. Since the primary function of a community college faculty person is instruction, seldom would he or she be heavily involved in committees, extracurricular activities and community activities simultaneously. It is expected, however, that faculty persons manage professional time in such a way that they are able to contribute their particular and valuable expertise to the college or community in areas beyond their particular teaching responsibilities. Sometimes this occurs when they are asked to serve on college committees or assume roles in extracurricular or community activities. More often, however, this valuable contribution occurs because of the ingenuity of faculty persons as they become involved in areas where they can contribute.

APPENDIX A

EVALUATION FORM FOR MANAGER'S EVALUATION OF FACULTY PERSON AT SOUTH OKLAHOMA CITY JUNIOR COLLEGE

Revised FY 1982-83

AREAS OF FACULTY EVALUATION
AT
SOUTH OKLAHOMA CITY JUNIOR COLLEGE

1. INSTRUCTOR EFFECTIVENESS WITH STUDENTS

In this area a faculty person is evaluated for effectiveness in interacting with students in formal and informal learning situations.

2. INSTRUCTOR EFFECTIVENESS WITH COURSE LEARNING MATERIALS

In this area a faculty person is evaluated for effectiveness in developing, revising, and/or maintaining quality learning materials for a particular course, including learning packets, syllabi, assessments, supplementary handouts, and audio-visual and alternate learning track materials.

3. INSTRUCTOR EFFECTIVENESS WITH INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

In this area a faculty person is evaluated for effectiveness in developing, improving, maintaining, and/or assessing quality in a degree or certificate program, multi-section courses (5 or more), or in programs such as Developmental Studies.

4. INSTRUCTOR EFFECTIVENESS WITH ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS

In this area a faculty person is evaluated for the quality of managing responsibilities in institute/college, including schedules, budgets, and production timelines (I.p.'s, grades, progress reports).

5. INSTRUCTOR EFFECTIVENESS WITH COLLEGE AND COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

In this area a faculty person is evaluated for quality of contribution to college and community activities which are directly related to being a professional educator, but less directly related to the faculty person's teaching responsibilities, including representation of the college in community events, and organization and implementation of extracurricular activities.

I. INSTRUCTOR EFFECTIVENESS WITH STUDENTS

In this area a faculty person is evaluated for effectiveness in interacting with students in formal and informal learning situations.

A. Items 3, 5, 6, 11, 16, 18, of the Student Instructional Report will be used as *standard* indicators of instructor effectiveness with students.

B. Items 1, 2, 8, 12, and 13 have been selected by faculty and managers as *special* indicators of instructor effectiveness.

C. The band defined by ± 0.1 of the three-year college mean on each of the SIR indicators is established as a range from which initial ratings are derived.

1. Standard Performance Indicators

   Standard performance will be evidenced when two indicators, one of which is a special indicator, are above or within the range.

2. Indicators of Below Standard Performance

   a. Below standard performance rating will be evidenced if all special indicators are below the range or if only one indicator is above or within the range.

   b. The lowest rating will be indicated if all standard indicators and special indicators are below the range.

   c. If one or more of the following conditions appear to exist, the matter(s) must be resolved before a standard or higher rating may be given.

      (1) Instructor is unfair with students.

      (2) Course is not taught according to the announced plan.

      (3) Instructor attendance in class and posted office hours have been unjustifiably irregular.

3. Indicators of Above Standard Performance

   a. Above standard rating will be evidenced when 10 of the 11 standard and special indicators are within or above the range.

   b. The highest rating will be evidenced when 10 of the 11 standard and special indicators are within or above the range and all special indicators are above the range.

4. Qualifying Indicators: Managers may raise or lower the initial rating one level because of:

   a. Substantial change in SIR from previous year.

   b. Significant change in student success from previous year.

   c. Formal or informal comments from students.

   d. Observations made by the manager.

   e. Performance in areas, mutually agreed upon by the faculty member and manager, which are measured by specific SIR items.

   f. Faculty person's accessibility to students.

_____	x	_____	=	_____
Weight		Category Rating (0-4)		Adjusted Performance Rating

(**Comments:** Category ratings of 0-1 or 3-4 require supporting rationale and information.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

II. INSTRUCTOR EFFECTIVENESS WITH COURSE LEARNING MATERIALS

In this area a faculty person is evaluated for effectiveness in developing, revising, and/or maintaining quality learning materials for a particular course, including learning packets, syllabi, assessments, supplementary handouts, audio-visual and alternate learning track materials.

A. Standard Performance Indicators

1. Learning packets include:

   a. Instructional objectives stated in behavioral terms including:

      (1) terminal behavior

      (2) behavioral conditions

      (3) criteria for acceptable performance

b. Pre-tests

c. Post-tests

d. Learning activities that specify how students achieve objectives

2. Test items match objectives in developed course(s).

3. Opportunities for multiple testing exist in developed course(s).

4. Module objectives combine to support the accomplishment of terminal objectives of the course(s).

5. A-V's developed

a. Directly support course objectives

b. Offer to student information comparable to other methods of delivery

B. Indicators of Below Standard Performance

1. Student complaints about learning materials.

2. Packets consistently reference unavailable learning materials.

3. Quality of manuscript necessitates return to author several times.

4. Contracted materials not in hands of students when needed.

C. Indicators of Above Standard Performance

1. Contracted materials make operational an alternate track with feedback loops.

2. Variety of learning activities are made operational.

3. Objectives include an appropriate variety of educational taxonomic levels.

4. Tests are designed to measure objectives at different educational taxonomic levels.

5. Faculty person has substantively increased the effectiveness of the assessment process through item analysis, using various testing techniques, etc.

6. Analysis and/or evaluation of materials have been finalized so that subsequent revision is possible.

Weight	x	Category Rating (0-4)	=	Adjusted Performance Rating

III. Instructor Effectiveness With Instructional Programs

In this area a faculty person is evaluated for effectiveness in developing, improving, maintaining, and/or assessing quality in a degree or certificate program, multi-section courses (5 or more), or in programs such as Developmental Studies.

A. Standard Performance Indicators

1. Faculty person has participated in a program evaluation.
2. Faculty person has participated in revisions based on program evaluation.
3. Faculty person has participated in the development of a new "program."
4. The program has a functional advisory committee.
5. Faculty person has participated in the program objectives as outlined in the contract.
6. Faculty person has participated in activities which maintain or improve program unity.

B. Indicators of Below Standard Performance

1. Non-functional advisory committee for which faculty person has some responsibility.
2. Non-participation in or failure to carry out program evaluation or revision based on evaluation.
3. Failure to develop program courses.
4. Not performing agreed to program objectives.

C. Indicators of Above Standard Performance

1. Faculty person has utilized resources to increase efficiency or effectiveness of the instructional program.

2. Faculty person's participation in program development or evaluation activities produces data and conclusions which realistically reveal the current status of the program and provides data and judgment for program improvements.
3. Faculty person's work with advisory committees has resulted in positive impact on program maintenance and/or improvement.
4. Faculty person has implemented long-range program development plans.
5. Faculty person has substantively increased the effectiveness of the course management process, thereby increasing the student's chances for success.

_____	x	_____	=	_____
Weight		Category Rating (0-4)		Adjusted Performance Rating

(Comments: Category ratings of 0-1 or 3-4 require supporting rationale and information.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

IV. INSTRUCTOR EFFECTIVENESS WITH ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS

In this area a faculty person is evaluated for the quality of managing responsibilities in the institute/college, including schedules, budgets, and production time-lines, (e.g., I.p.'s, grades, progress reports).

A. Standard Performance Indicators

1. Faculty person has provided requested usable schedule and/or budget information in time to meet published deadlines.
2. Faculty person has provided material for printing in conformance with agreed upon deadlines.
3. Faculty person has posted and abided by a weekly schedule which allows student accessibility.
4. Faculty person has conducted school-related activities in conformance with published procedures.
5. Faculty person has provided student progress and correct grade reports in conformance with published deadlines.

6. Faculty person has provided complete and usable auxiliary records to include grade books, "I" and "IC" records, and attendance information.

B. Indicators of Below Standard Performance

1. Failure to meet one or more grade report deadlines.
2. Less than timely response to other prescribed deadlines (i.e., schedules, budgets, printing).
3. Repeated failure to perform school-related activities in conformance with published procedures and policies.
4. Repeated failure to post and adhere to weekly schedules.
5. Failure to administer SIR at designated times.
6. Repeated failure to meet progress report deadlines.

C. Indicators of Above Standard Performance

1. Schedule information is accurate, usable, well documented, and reflects student needs and institute resources.
2. Budget information is detailed, accurate, based on realistic projection of program needs and is well documented.
3. Faculty person consistently submits materials for typing and/or printing well in advance of the time necessary to ensure completion prior to needed deadline.
4. Faculty person plans ahead, anticipates student and program needs and provides administrative input well in advance of deadlines.

_____	x	_____	=	_____
Weight		Category Rating (0-4)		Adjusted Performance Rating

(Comments: Category ratings of 0-1 or 3-4 require supporting rationale and information.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

V. INSTRUCTOR EFFECTIVENESS WITH COLLEGE AND COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

In this area a faculty person is evaluated for quality of contribution to activities which are directly related to being a professional educator, but less directly related to the faculty person's teaching responsibilities, including representation of the college in community events, and organization and implementation of extracurricular activities.

A. Standard Performance Indicators

1. Faculty person has worked on a college committee.
2. Faculty person has represented the college in a community activity not related to his specific assignment.

B. Indicators of Below Standard Performance

1. Faculty person has not participated in any activity covered in this area.
2. Faculty person has failed to follow through on agreed upon commitments.

C. Indicators of Above Standard Performance

1. Faculty person's participation in college committees or events has contributed significantly to the purpose of the committee or event.
2. Feedback indicates that the faculty person's participation in community events has resulted in positive recognition for the college.
3. Faculty person has organized and implemented extracurricular student activities not directly related to a specific course he/she teaches.

_____	x	_____	=	_____
Weight		Category Rating (0-4)		Adjusted Performance Rating

(Comments: Category ratings of 0-1 or 3-4 require supporting rationale and information.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

ADJUSTED PERFORMANCE RATING

Category I - Instructor Effectiveness with Students _____

Category II - Instructor Effectiveness with Course Learning Materials _____

Category III - Instructor Effectiveness with Instructional Programs _____

Category IV - Instructor Effectiveness with Administrative Functions _____

Category V - Instructor Effectiveness with College and Community Activities _____

TOTAL
(Composite Performance Rating) _____

TOTAL
(Composite Performance Rating
to Nearest Whole Number) _____

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION WEIGHTING

A typical faculty person will continue to be evaluated according to the following category weightings:

Category	Weighting
I. Instructor effectiveness with students	25%
II. Instructor effectiveness with course learning materials	25%
III. Instructor effectiveness with instructional programs	25%
IV. Instructor effectiveness with administrative functions	15%
V. Instructor effectiveness with college and community activities	10%

When either a faculty member or the manager recommends assigning a different weighting to any of the above areas for the ensuing contract year, a proposal will be developed which includes a rationale for an increase or decrease in category weightings with appropriate measurable performance objectives, criteria for accomplishing the objectives and appropriate time lines for completion. The faculty member and manager must then agree on category weightings within the ranges listed below, and receive approval from the Dean of Instruction.

Category	Range Min.	Range Max.
I. Instructor effectiveness with students	25%	35%
II. Instructor effectiveness with course learning materials	15%	30%
III. Instructor effectiveness with instructional programs (The sum of percentages for categories I, II, and III must be equal to or greater than 70%)	15%	30%
IV. Instructor effectiveness with administrative functions	10%	20%
V. Instructor effectiveness with college and community activities	10%	20%

These category weightings *must* be agreed upon prior to contract signing.

APPENDIX B

EVALUATION FORM
FOR
FACULTY PERSON'S SELF EVALUATION
AT
SOUTH OKLAHOMA CITY
JUNIOR COLLEGE

Revised FY 1982-83

AREAS OF FACULTY EVALUATION
AT
SOUTH OKLAHOMA CITY JUNIOR COLLEGE

1. INSTRUCTOR EFFECTIVENESS WITH STUDENTS

In this area a faculty person is evaluated for effectiveness in interacting with students in formal and informal learning situations.

2. INSTRUCTOR EFFECTIVENESS WITH COURSE LEARNING MATERIALS

In this area a faculty person is evaluated for effectiveness in developing, revising, and/or maintaining quality learning materials for a particular course, including learning packets, syllabi, assessments, supplementary handouts, and audio-visual and alternate learning track materials.

3. INSTRUCTOR EFFECTIVENESS WITH INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

In this area a faculty person is evaluated for effectiveness in developing, improving, maintaining, and/or assessing quality in a degree or certificate program, multi-section courses (5 or more), or in programs such as Developmental Studies.

4. INSTRUCTOR EFFECTIVENESS WITH ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS

In this area a faculty person is evaluated for the quality of managing responsibilities in institute/college, including schedules, budgets, and production timelines (I.p.'s, grades, progress reports).

5. INSTRUCTOR EFFECTIVENESS WITH COLLEGE AND COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

In this area a faculty person is evaluated for quality of contribution to college and community activities which are directly related to being a professional educator, but less directly related to the faculty person's teaching responsibilities, including representation of the college in community events, and organization and implementation of extracurricular activities.

I. INSTRUCTOR EFFECTIVENESS WITH STUDENTS

In this area a faculty person is evaluated for effectiveness in interacting with students in formal and informal learning situations.

A. Items 3, 5, 6, 11, 16, 18, of the Student Instructional Report will be used as *standard* indicators of instructor effectiveness with students.

B. Items 1, 2, 8, 12, and 13 have been selected by faculty and managers as *special* indicators of instructor effectiveness.

C. The band defined by ± 0.1 of the three-year college mean on each of the SIR indicators is established as a range from which initial ratings are derived.

1. Standard Performance Indicators

   Standard performance will be evidenced when two indicators, one of which is a special indicator, are above or within the range.

2. Indicators of Below Standard Performance

   a. Below standard performance rating will be evidenced if all special indicators are below the range or if only one indicator is above or within the range.

   b. The lowest rating will be indicated if all standard indicators and special indicators are below the range.

   c. If one or more of the following conditions appear to exist, the matter(s) must be resolved before a standard or higher rating may be given.

      (1) Instructor is unfair with students.

      (2) Course is not taught according to the announced plan.

      (3) Instructor attendance in class and posted office hours have been unjustifiably irregular.

3. Indicators of Above Standard Performance

   a. Above standard rating will be evidenced when 10 of the 11 standard and special indicators are within or above the range.

   b. The highest rating will be evidenced when 10 of the 11 standard and special indicators are within or above the range and all special indicators are above the range.

4. Qualifying Indicators: Managers may raise or lower the initial rating one level because of:

   a. Substantial change in SIR from previous year.

   b. Significant change in student success from previous year.

   c. Formal or informal comments from students.

   d. Observations made by the manager.

   e. Performance in areas, mutually agreed upon by the faculty member and manager, which are measured by specific SIR items.

   f. Faculty person's accessibility to students.

_____	x	_____	=	_____
Weight		Category Rating (0-4)		Adjusted Performance Rating

(Comments: Category ratings of 0-1 or 3-4 require supporting rationale and information.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

II. INSTRUCTOR EFFECTIVENESS WITH COURSE LEARNING MATERIALS

In this area a faculty person is evaluated for effectiveness in developing, revising, and/or maintaining quality learning materials for a particular course, including learning packets, syllabi, assessments, supplementary handouts, audio-visual and alternate learning track materials.

A. Standard Performance Indicators

   1. Learning packets include:

      a. Instructional objectives stated in behavioral terms including:

         (1) terminal behavior

         (2) behavioral conditions

         (3) criteria for acceptable performance

b. Pre-tests

c. Post-tests

d. Learning activities that specify how students achieve objectives

2. Test items match objectives in developed course(s).

3. Opportunities for multiple testing exist in developed course(s).

4. Module objectives combine to support the accomplishment of terminal objectives of the course(s).

5. A-V's developed

a. Directly support course objectives

b. Offer to student information comparable to other methods of delivery

B. Indicators of Below Standard Performance

1. Student complaints about learning materials.

2. Packets consistently reference unavailable learning materials.

3. Quality of manuscript necessitates return to author several times.

4. Contracted materials not in hands of students when needed.

C. Indicators of Above Standard Performance

1. Contracted materials make operational an alternate track with feedback loops.

2. Variety of learning activities are made operational.

3. Objectives include an appropriate variety of educational taxonomic levels.

4. Tests are designed to measure objectives at different educational taxonomic levels.

5. Faculty person has substantively increased the effectiveness of the assessment process through item analysis, using various testing techniques, etc.

6. Analysis and/or evaluation of materials have been finalized so that subsequent revision is possible.

Weight	x	Category Rating (0-4)	=	Adjusted Performance Rating

III. Instructor Effectiveness With Instructional Programs

In this area a faculty person is evaluated for effectiveness in developing, improving, maintaining, and/or assessing quality in a degree or certificate program, multi-section courses (5 or more), or in programs such as Developmental Studies.

A. Standard Performance Indicators

1. Faculty person has participated in a program evaluation.
2. Faculty person has participated in revisions based on program evaluation.
3. Faculty person has participated in the development of a new "program."
4. The program has a functional advisory committee.
5. Faculty person has participated in the program objectives as outlined in the contract.
6. Faculty person has participated in activities which maintain or improve program unity.

B. Indicators of Below Standard Performance

1. Non-functional advisory committee for which faculty person has some responsibility.
2. Non-participation in or failure to carry out program evaluation or revision based on evaluation.
3. Failure to develop program courses.
4. Not performing agreed to program objectives.

C. Indicators of Above Standard Performance

1. Faculty person has utilized resources to increase efficiency or effectiveness of the instructional program.

2. Faculty person's participation in program development or evaluation activities produces data and conclusions which realistically reveal the current status of the program and provides data and judgment for program improvements.
3. Faculty person's work with advisory committees has resulted in positive impact on program maintenance and/or improvement.
4. Faculty person has implemented long-range program development plans.
5. Faculty person has substantively increased the effectiveness of the course management process, thereby increasing the student's chances for success.

_____	x	_____	=	_____
Weight		Category Rating (0-4)		Adjusted Performance Rating

(Comments: Category ratings of 0-1 or 3-4 require supporting rationale and information.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

IV. INSTRUCTOR EFFECTIVENESS WITH ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS

In this area a faculty person is evaluated for the quality of managing responsibilities in the institute/college, including schedules, budgets, and production time-lines, (e.g., I.p.'s, grades, progress reports).

A. Standard Performance Indicators

1. Faculty person has provided requested usable schedule and/or budget information in time to meet published deadlines.
2. Faculty person has provided material for printing in conformance with agreed upon deadlines.
3. Faculty person has posted and abided by a weekly schedule which allows student accessibility.
4. Faculty person has conducted school-related activities in conformance with published procedures.
5. Faculty person has provided student progress and correct grade reports in conformance with published deadlines.

6. Faculty person has provided complete and usable auxiliary records to include grade books, "I" and "IC" records, and attendance information.

B. Indicators of Below Standard Performance

1. Failure to meet one or more grade report deadlines.
2. Less than timely response to other prescribed deadlines (i.e., schedules, budgets, printing).
3. Repeated failure to perform school-related activities in conformance with published procedures and policies.
4. Repeated failure to post and adhere to weekly schedules.
5. Failure to administer SIR at designated times.
6. Repeated failure to meet progress report deadlines.

C. Indicators of Above Standard Performance

1. Schedule information is accurate, usable, well documented, and reflects student needs and institute resources.
2. Budget information is detailed, accurate, based on realistic projection of program needs and is well documented.
3. Faculty person consistently submits materials for typing and/or printing well in advance of the time necessary to ensure completion prior to needed deadline.
4. Faculty person plans ahead, anticipates student and program needs and provides administrative input well in advance of deadlines.

_____	x	_____	=	_____
Weight		Category Rating (0-4)		Adjusted Performance Rating

(**Comments:** Category ratings of 0-1 or 3-4 require supporting rationale and infortion.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

V. INSTRUCTOR EFFECTIVENESS WITH COLLEGE AND COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

In this area a faculty person is evaluated for quality of contribution to activities which are directly related to being a professional educator, but less directly related to the faculty person's teaching responsibilities, including representation of the college in community events, and organization and implementation of extracurricular activities.

A. Standard Performance Indicators

1. Faculty person has worked on a college committee.
2. Faculty person has represented the college in a community activity not related to his specific assignment.

B. Indicators of Below Standard Performance

1. Faculty person has not participated in any activity covered in this area.
2. Faculty person has failed to follow through on agreed upon commitments.

C. Indicators of Above Standard Performance

1. Faculty person's participation in college committees or events has contributed significantly to the purpose of the committee or event.
2. Feedback indicates that the faculty person's participation in community events has resulted in positive recognition for the college.
3. Faculty person has organized and implemented extracurricular student activities not directly related to a specific course he/she teaches.

_____	x	_____	=	_____
Weight		Category Rating (0-4)		Adjusted Performance Rating

(**Comments:** Category ratings of 0-1 or 3-4 require supporting rationale and information.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

ADJUSTED PERFORMANCE RATING

Category I - Instructor Effectiveness with Students _____

Category II - Instructor Effectiveness with Course Learning Materials _____

Category III - Instructor Effectiveness with Instructional Programs _____

Category IV - Instructor Effectiveness with Administrative Functions _____

Category V - Instructor Effectiveness with College and Community Activities _____

TOTAL
(Composite Performance Rating) _____

TOTAL
(Composite Performance Rating
to Nearest Whole Number) _____

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION WEIGHTING

A typical faculty person will continue to be evaluated according to the following category weightings:

Category	Weighting
I. Instructor effectiveness with students	25%
II. Instructor effectiveness with course learning materials	25%
III. Instructor effectiveness with instructional programs	25%
IV. Instructor effectiveness with administrative functions	15%
V. Instructor effectiveness with college and community activities	10%

When either a faculty member or the manager recommends assigning a different weighting to any of the above areas for the ensuing contract year, a proposal will be developed which includes a rationale for an increase or decrease in category weightings with appropriate measurable performance objectives, criteria for accomplishing the objectives and appropriate time lines for completion. The faculty member and manager must then agree on category weightings within the ranges listed below, and receive approval from the Dean of instruction.

Category	Range Min.	Range Max.
I. Instructor effectiveness with students	25%	35%
II. Instructor effectiveness with course learning materials	15%	30%
III. Instructor effectiveness with instructional programs (The sum of percentages for categories I, II, and III must be equal to or greater than 70%)	15%	30%
IV. Instructor effectiveness with administrative functions	10%	20%
V. Instructor effectiveness with college and community activities	10%	20%

These category weightings *must* be agreed upon prior to contract signing.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
8118 Math-Sciences Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

JUN 24 1983